UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION

No. 5:14-CR-244-BR No. 5:16-CV-78-BR

ANTHONY ARTIS,)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
Respondent.)	

On 15 August 2018, on petitioner's request, U.S. Magistrate Judge Robert B. Jones, Jr. ordered petitioner's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, including amendments, held in abeyance pending a decision in <u>United States v. Simms</u>, No. 15-4640 (4th Cir. Filed Oct. 26, 2015), and directed the parties to file a status report within 14 days of the <u>Simms</u> decision. (DE # 63.)

On 24 January 2019, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals *en banc* issued that decision, holding that 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(3)(B), otherwise known as the "residual clause" of the definition of a "crime of violence," is unconstitutionally vague. <u>United States v. Simms</u>, 914 F.3d 229, 236 (4th Cir. 2019). However, the Fourth Circuit stayed issuance of the mandate pending the Court's decision in <u>United States v. Davis</u>, No. 18-431, ____ S. Ct. ___, 2019 WL 98544 (cert. granted Jan. 4, 2019). <u>United States v. Simms</u>, No. 15-4640 (4th Cir. Feb. 4, 2019).

In light of the <u>Simms</u> decision, the parties here timely filed their respective status reports and debate whether <u>Simms</u> is binding on this court prior to the issuance of the mandate. (DE ## 64, 65.) Petitioner requests that the court apply <u>Simms</u> now, vacate his sentence, and schedule a resentencing hearing. The government maintains that <u>Simms</u> is not the law of the Fourth Circuit until the mandate issues, and therefore, this proceeding remains in abeyance.

Alternatively, the government requests that the proceeding be held in abeyance pending the

decision in Davis.

The parties agree that the Court in <u>Davis</u> granted certiorari on the same question at issue in <u>Simms</u>. Petition for Writ of Certiorari at I, <u>United States v. Davis</u>, No. 18-431, 2018 WL 4896751, at *I (U.S. Oct. 3, 2018). Whatever the precedential value of <u>Simms</u> at this time, the court concludes that this proceeding should be held in abeyance pending the decision in <u>Davis</u>. Accordingly, petitioner's § 2255 motion and amendments thereto are hereby STAYED pending the decision in <u>Davis</u>. Within 14 days of the decision in <u>Davis</u>, the parties shall file briefs setting forth their respective positions on the effect of that decision on this proceeding.

This 26 March 2019.

W. Earl Britt

Senior U.S. District Judge